

1 to, and it was a -- a mistake, an unfortunate, you  
2 know, mistake.

3 Q Now --

4 A It was easy to be -- I mean it was -- the  
5 manufacturer, their identifying tag was missing so --  
6 and it was a mixed area so.

7 Q Now, Mr. Bowen, my question is is that  
8 Osmose had done a lot of poles -- has lifted a lot of  
9 poles in Pensacola? Is that right?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Do you know if they made any mistakes on  
12 any other poles, as far as the identify of the owner,  
13 that they looked at?

14 A I do not know of any others.

15 Q You had also looked at and mentioned pole  
16 number 18, which is in Exhibit 42 on page 35? Is that  
17 right?

18 A This isn't the right pole. I'm sorry,  
19 John, this isn't the right pole. I'd have to flip  
20 through them to find it, but that's not the right  
21 photo.

22 Q Just so I'm clear so we know what we're

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 looking for, when you were mentioning the -- the two  
2 poles that you had removed, the one we're agreeing on  
3 now is pole number 35, which appears on page 69 on  
4 Exhibit 42, because of the mismarking of it and that  
5 it was a Bell South pole. And when you mentioned pole  
6 18, which I understand you're not sure of now, which  
7 appears on page 35 in Exhibit 42, you had mentioned  
8 the -- the pole that you had removed was for purposes  
9 that there was a separation issue between  
10 communications drops?

11 A Yes, sir.

12 Q That was your testimony? And nothing on  
13 pole number 18 on that page 35 of Exhibit 42 has --  
14 mentions that there was a problem with the space  
15 between communications drops? Is that right?

16 A I haven't looked at it yet, but --

17 Q I was just trying to make sure why that we  
18 -- how you knew that this wasn't the pole that you  
19 were referring to?

20 A I recognize -- Mr. Seiver, I would  
21 recognize the photo, and this isn't the right photo.  
22 Because this -- it would be -- it's a stud pole, and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this has got primaries on it.

2 MR. COOK: For purposes of clarification,  
3 we're sitting over here observing that the witnesses  
4 are crossing paths. I think they have their  
5 descriptions of the pictures flipped. I think that's  
6 what's going on here. It might facilitate it. Mr.  
7 Bowen, if you could look at pole 35.

8 THE WITNESS: Okay.

9 MR. COOK: And Mr. Seiver, if you want me  
10 to stop from trying to straighten it out for you, I  
11 will. I'll let you do it, but I think I can  
12 straighten it out. Is picture 35 the picture that has  
13 the service drop issue.

14 THE WITNESS: What -- and that page is  
15 what --

16 MR. COOK: That's page 70 in Exhibit 42,  
17 sir.

18 THE WITNESS: I apologize. Bingo. That's  
19 correct.

20 MR. COOK: Then flip back over to page 35  
21 and pole number 18. Is that the pole that has the  
22 issue with respect to the ownership of the pole?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 THE WITNESS: Yes, it does.

2 MR. COOK: Take it rom there, Mr. Seiver.

3 MR. SEIVER: Thank you. So -- just so the  
4 record's correct then, when you were correcting your  
5 testimony, we need to reverse the descriptions on  
6 poles 18 and pole 35?

7 THE WITNESS: That's my understanding. I  
8 apologize for that misunderstanding.

9 MR. SEIVER: No problem.

10 JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. So 18 was the one  
11 that was mismarked? Is that right, pole 18 was  
12 mismarked and --

13 MR. SEIVER: That's right.

14 JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Just flip them.

15 MR. SEIVER: And that pole 35 actually is  
16 -- does not have any violations, so it's not a crowded  
17 a full-capacity pole? Is that what you're saying?  
18 Pole 35.

19 THE WITNESS: I've got some issues with  
20 it, but none of which -- I'd concede to that one. I  
21 don't believe it's crowded.

22 BY MR. SEIVER:

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Q       When you were looking at the poles, did  
2       you also -- if you would stay on Exhibit 42 -- would  
3       you also help me out and turn to page 17 -- and if you  
4       need to look at the picture that's on page 18, please  
5       do, but I'm going to ask you about page 17 of Exhibit  
6       42, and it's pole nine. And, Your Honor for the  
7       record, we have been using some of the other picture  
8       numbers which appear in exhibits. This also has a  
9       pole number designated as 3022 space 50. And Mr.  
10      Bowen, if you've looked at it, is that a pole that --  
11      one of the poles of the -- of the 40 that you visited  
12      -- you remember?

13           A       Mr. Seiver, I don't remember in particular  
14      this one. It's -- I'll be glad to talk to you about  
15      it. I mean I can -- I -- I've got a pretty good idea  
16      what -- what happened with it based on the description  
17      here.

18           Q       Well, if you look at page 17 --

19           A       Yes.

20           Q       -- and where the columns are for  
21      violations, it says violation of less than 52 inches  
22      between power/comm, then a space and yes. Would you

1 tell us what that means to you?

2 A What that means is this -- this fits the  
3 Gulf Power definition of crowding. In our definition,  
4 we -- we'd stipulate that it would be an NESC  
5 violation, Gulf Power violation or any other  
6 applicable code or one that would not accept another  
7 attacher. In this particular case is what we're --  
8 what they're saying here is is that there is a --  
9 there wouldn't be room between communication and power  
10 for an additional attacher because you would have to  
11 have -- in this particular, you would need 40 inches  
12 plus 12 for an additional attacher, so that totals to  
13 52. That's where the 52 comes from. So in this  
14 particular case, there's not room for another  
15 attacher. Therefore, crowded, and that's why -- and  
16 that's the way the Osmose Statement of Work was set  
17 out in order to, you know, find this type of problem.

18 JUDGE SIPPEL: What pole are you referring  
19 to again? On what page of 42 are you at?

20 THE WITNESS: Okay. We are on pole number  
21 nine of the 40, and this is page 17. And the photo is  
22 on page 18.

1 JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you.

2 BY MR. SEIVER:

3 Q Now Mr. Bowen, let me go back to the --  
4 the 52 inches. What Osmose was looking for then at  
5 your direction was separations of 52 inches or less or  
6 less than 52 inches between power and communications?

7 A Well, we were looking for -- let's see --

8 Q Just for that -- that aspect. I know  
9 there are other ones. I'm just asking you about that  
10 particular measurement. Are you doing the math --

11 A Yes.

12 Q -- calculate the difference?

13 A Yes.

14 JUDGE SIPPEL: Sir, you have to answer yes  
15 or no. You're answering yes --

16 THE WITNESS: I am answering yes.

17 BY MR. SEIVER:

18 Q For the record then, would you be  
19 calculating the -- the difference between the highest  
20 communications mainline cable which is 21 feet and the  
21 lowest power cable?

22 A Yes, sir, I would be.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Q And is that twenty-five five?

2 A It comes to twenty-four four -- --twenty-  
3 five -- Osmose states it's twenty-five five for a  
4 secondary. That's correct.

5 Q So what is the difference between twenty-  
6 five five and twenty-one zero?

7 A The difference between twenty-five five  
8 and twenty-one zero is four feet five inches.

9 Q And that's 53 inches?

10 A That's correct.

11 Q So the -- it is not less than 52 inches  
12 between power and communications? It's actually 53  
13 inches? Is that right?

14 A Based on this measurement, but visually,  
15 Osmose saw that it was a violation, and you can --  
16 this actually is possible even with those  
17 measurements, because when you're sticking a pole on  
18 the top, let's say in this particular case it's going  
19 to be in our secondary, you put the hook on the  
20 secondary, you can visually -- you know where the 52  
21 inch mark is, and you can see that it's within that  
22 mark. Now because of the variation in the ground

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 measurement, you might end up with an inch off, even  
2 though in fact there is a separation problem on the  
3 pole.

4 Q Let me -- I'm really going to need you to  
5 focus on answering my questions. If you feel like you  
6 need to say something else, maybe it'll come out on  
7 redirect, but looking at this exhibit, just looking t  
8 the way this exhibit is done, the figures that are  
9 entered on this exhibit, that's an error to say that,  
10 yes, there's less than 52 inches between?

11 A Based on those numbers, that it -- that  
12 would be in error.

13 JUDGE SIPPEL: And again, you're on  
14 Exhibit 42, page 17?

15 MR. SEIVER: Correct. Yes, Your Honor.

16 BY MR. SEIVER:

17 Q And as a result of it being at 53 inches,  
18 there's not only current room for existing attachers,  
19 but there is room for an additional attacher? Is that  
20 right?

21 A If that was the correct numbers, that  
22 would be correct, yes.

1 Q And you're -- have -- you're telling me  
2 now you have reason to doubt the correctness of the  
3 numbers that have been entered in the, at least on  
4 page 17, of Exhibit 42.

5 A What I'm saying is is that -- that-- that  
6 --

7 Q Can you say yes or no on that answer?

8 A Can you restate the question, please?

9 Q You are telling me, are you not, that you  
10 have reason to doubt the accuracy of the numbers that  
11 are entered on the page 17 of Exhibit 42?

12 A Yes, sir.

13 Q My follow-up question will be is do you  
14 have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the numbers  
15 on any of the other pages in Exhibit 42?

16 A I haven't checked every single number on  
17 all these changes, Mr. Seiver, but I don't have any  
18 other reason to believe any others are incorrect.

19 Q But at least would it be fair to say that  
20 we should withdraw pole number nine from the listing  
21 of poles that of the 40 -- instead of saying that the  
22 38 are crowded, that we would say 37 are crowded or

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you're not willing to do that?

2 A Based on the -- based on the numbers on  
3 the page and --and -- and it being -- and -- fair, I  
4 think that would be -- I'd be okay with that.

5 Q I'm sorry?

6 A I'd be okay with that. We want to be fair  
7 about it.

8 Q Let me understand also is crowded and full  
9 capacity. You've talked and used those terms, and I  
10 believe each of the pages in Exhibit 42 that has the  
11 data on it, not the photographs, says crowded or full  
12 capacity power poles. In your testimony and your --  
13 it's been submitted here, do you equate the terms  
14 crowded with full capacity or are they something else?

15 A I -- I'd -- full capacity and crowded to  
16 me are the -- are the same -- same thing.

17 Q Did you tell Osmose something differently  
18 so that they would say crowded or full capacity. On  
19 the assumption that if they're the same, I don't  
20 understand why the connector or would be in there,  
21 which would, to me, would suggest that it's something  
22 else in there. Did you tell them something else?

1           A       What -- I'm not sure what you're referring  
2 to when you say tell Osmose.

3           Q       Were you part of the personnel within Gulf  
4 Power that spoke to Osmose during the process of the  
5 audit or survey of Gulf Power's poles in Pensacola?

6           A       Yes, I was.

7           Q       Did you ever --

8           JUDGE SIPPEL: Can I -- can I make a  
9 suggestion? I'm sorry to interrupt you, but might it  
10 be good to ask who prepared this document, page 17 of  
11 Exhibit 42?

12           BY MR. SEIVER:

13           Q       Mr. Bowen, do you know who prepared this  
14 document that is Exhibit 42, page one for example or  
15 page 17? We were on page 17?

16           JUDGE SIPPEL: Page 17, yes, sir.

17           THE WITNESS: The information -- the data  
18 is from Osmose. The formatting is from Gulf Power  
19 Company.

20           BY MR. SEIVER:

21           Q       Do you know who within Gulf Power prepared  
22 the page that appears as page 17 in Exhibit 42 from

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 the Osmose data?

2 A Yes, I do.

3 Q And who is that person?

4 A Christine Phillips.

5 Q And does Christine Phillips report to you?

6 A No, she does not.

7 Q Who does she report to?

8 A Ed Battaglia.

9 Q And who is Ed Battaglia?

10 A He's a Manager in the Distribution section  
11 at Gulf Power Company.

12 Q Do you work with Mr. Battaglia?

13 A I have worked with him, yes.

14 Q And do you know how either Christine or  
15 Mr. Battaglia were given the measurements that Osmose  
16 had made for purposes of preparing the document which  
17 appears as page 17?

18 A Access database.

19 Q I'm sorry?

20 A Access database.

21 Q And were you involved in that process at  
22 all of the Osmose measurements being transmitted to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Mr. Battaglia or, I'm sorry, I forgot the name,  
2 Christine.

3 A Christine Phillips?

4 Q Christine.

5 A That came directly from Osmose to her  
6 computer.

7 Q Did you review any of -- of the  
8 information that was sent to Ms. Phillips' computer?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Did you review the pages that Ms. Phillips  
11 generated based on the Osmose data?

12 A This page right here?

13 Q Yes. Any of the pages. The outliers this  
14 particular page, would you have reviewed this  
15 particular page before it became an exhibit to Gulf  
16 Power trial submission?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Did you approve its format?

19 A Yes, generally, I -- I -- I thought it was  
20 a nice job.

21 Q Did you chose the language at the top at  
22 the header where it says crowded or full capacity Gulf

1 Power poles from Osmose on it?

2 A John, I don't remember who -- who directed  
3 her to do that.

4 Q Well, let me ask you specifically on -- on  
5 crowded. You said you were looking for a minimum of  
6 52 inches between power and communications. The NESC  
7 requirement and the Gulf Power spec for separation  
8 between power and communications is 40 inches? Is  
9 that right?

10 A Depending on what the -- the Gulf Power  
11 item would be on the pole, but we're talking about  
12 secondary neutral, it's 40 inches.

13 Q Do you know what they were referring to in  
14 that first line that says violation of less than when  
15 it says 52 inches between power and communication?  
16 Were they referring to the -- the 40 inches that we  
17 just mentioned to which 12 inches was added?

18 A Yes, sir.

19 Q And the point being that if there were  
20 more than 40 inches but less than 52 inches between  
21 power and communications, and let's look at this  
22 particular pole that we at on page 17, the existing

1       attachers would all be in compliance with the code and  
2       it would only be that no additional attacher could be  
3       put on to the pole? Is that right.

4               A       If I understood you correctly, what you're  
5       saying is is that -- that if this was in fact the say  
6       52 or less -- I mean, excuse me, less than 52 inches,  
7       then it would be true then that another attacher would  
8       not be able to get on the pole without a clearance  
9       issued, then that would be true.

10              Q       But the existing attachers would be in  
11       compliance?

12              A       The existing attachers would be.

13              Q       And in finding on this particular pole, if  
14       we assume the Osmose measurements, and I understand  
15       that -- that it was 53 inches, this will hold -- would  
16       hold one more attacher without any make-ready review -  
17       -

18              A       I'm not willing to concede that, Mr.  
19       Seiver, because I -- I've explained that -- that there  
20       is, you know, could be an inch off one way or the  
21       other, and that that is possible that it's still  
22       valid. It just wasn't recorded properly.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1 Q Now as far as --

2 JUDGE SIPPEL: Did you finish. Did -- did  
3 you want to say more?

4 THE WITNESS: I was -- I was trying, you  
5 know, trying to complete sentence.

6 JUDGE SIPPEL: What were you going to say.  
7 Well, finish your sentence.

8 THE WITNESS: I just think that I'm not --  
9 I'm not -- I'm not -- I'm not willing to say that it's  
10 100 percent certain that -- that there actually is an  
11 error there.

12 BY MR. SEIVER:

13 Q Mistakes were made you think?

14 A I think that we acknowledged that we had  
15 humans working for Osmose doing this, and then when  
16 humans are involved, there's going to be a certain  
17 degree of error.

18 Q Now in the choice between the -- the 40  
19 inches and the 52 inches, we'd already established  
20 that 40 is the minimum between power and  
21 communications. In any of the poles that are listed  
22 in Exhibit 42, did you ever examine to see if any of

1 the poles had clearances between power and  
2 communications of somewhere between 40 and 52?

3 A Did I personally check that?

4 Q Yes.

5 A Yes, I did.

6 Q And did you see any number of them that  
7 did have those clearances?

8 A I did observe that.

9 Q And as we stand here today, just based on  
10 that measurement alone, that particular pole would be  
11 compliant, it just would not be able to host another  
12 attachment without some make-ready if it had between  
13 40 and 52 inches

14 A That's --

15 Q -- between power and communications?

16 A As I stated earlier, the purpose of that  
17 measurement was to identify if there could be an  
18 additional attacher, and if -- if there was 52 inches,  
19 anyone else below that would be in compliance with the  
20 40 inch separation, but I'm not certain without more  
21 information if there wouldn't be any other clearance  
22 issues depending on who's below that 40 inches.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Q     Now on the poles that are in Exhibit 42,  
2     to your understanding, was any determination made as  
3     to whether another attacher had requested access to a  
4     particular pole.

5           A     Say that one more time, Mr. Seiver?

6           Q     For any of the poles in Exhibit 42, the 40  
7     poles that are included, well, 38, I guess that were  
8     included, did you make any determination that there  
9     was another attacher that was seeking to attach to  
10    that particular pole?

11          A     Did I search another buyer waiting for --  
12    to get on these poles? Is that what you're asking me?

13          Q     No. I asked you if you were aware that  
14    there had been any request for access to that pole?

15          A     I have not checked and, therefore, I'm not  
16    aware.

17          Q     As far as the particular poles in Exhibit  
18    42, could you explain to me how those particular poles  
19    were chosen, if you know, to become part of the  
20    exhibit?

21          A     I think they were chosen in order to be  
22    representative of a wide variety of -- of situations.

1 In other words, I didn't want to load them all up with  
2 poles with 20 and 30 violations.

3 Q You didn't want to also designate any  
4 poles that Osmose might have found that were not  
5 crowded or full capacity? Is that right?

6 A That -- well, that would have been -- the  
7 point would be to provide poles that were crowded.

8 Q Because there are poles that are not  
9 crowded or at full capacity in your system? Is that  
10 right?

11 A There's -- there are some. That's  
12 absolutely true. Sure.

13 Q And if -- sorry -- strike that. Were you  
14 part of the process in establishing the audit and  
15 survey that Osmose was doing on the Gulf Power poles?

16 A Yes, I was.

17 Q And did you select Pensacola as the area  
18 for them to start in?

19 A I was a part of that decision, yes.

20 Q And do you recall that the survey and  
21 audit began in -- in the spring of 2005? Do you  
22 remember that?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 A Yes, I do.

2 Q And do you remember or did you ever see  
3 any status reports that were provided about the  
4 progress of the audit or survey?

5 A Yes, I did.

6 Q And is it fair to say that in May of 2005,  
7 you told Osmose to stop?

8 A Did I tell them to stop in May?

9 Q Correct.

10 A No, sir, I did not. What I -- I believe  
11 what I said was that I wanted them to switch from  
12 first pass to second pass up until a threshold of  
13 \$100,000.00.

14 Q And when did that threshold get met, if  
15 you recall?

16 A I believe it was 6/25, I believe. It was  
17 in that week, I believe, 6/25. And that was from the  
18 Osmose report.

19 Q And no more poles, though, were examined  
20 in June compared May? There was just a second pass on  
21 the poles that were looked at in May? Is that right?

22 A Well, I don't have all the data in front

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of me as far as the Osmose reports, but if you want to  
2 lay them all out, I guess we can read them and -- and  
3 make a determination.

4 Q What was your understanding of the purpose  
5 of the Osmose survey?

6 A We're looking for crowded poles.

7 Q Did you understand that it was to include  
8 all of Gulf Power's poles in its service area?

9 A I did not understand that.

10 Q Who communicated to you what the purpose  
11 of the Osmose survey was?

12 A That would have come from our attorneys.

13 Q And did you establish the Statement of  
14 Work with -- with Osmose as to what the parameters  
15 were going to be for the survey?

16 A Yes, I did.

17 Q And do you remember if you had directed  
18 them to survey the entirety of your service area?

19 A I didn't ask them to do that.

20 Q What did you ask them to do --

21 A I asked them to check all of the joint use  
22 poles.

1 Q I'm sorry. All of the joint use poles in  
2 your service area?

3 A That was -- Statement of Work.

4 Q And how many joint use poles are there in  
5 your service area?

6 A I don't know the number.

7 Q Is it more than 10,000?

8 A Yes, sir.

9 Q Is it more than 100,000?

10 A Yes, sir.

11 Q About 150,000? Does that sound closer?

12 A That's approximately correct, and I will  
13 know that number -- I mean that's approximately  
14 correct. I don't know the exact number. I wish I  
15 could tell you.

16 JUDGE SIPPEL: By joint use, are you  
17 referring to ILEC as well as cable or just --

18 THE WITNESS: I'm -- I'm referring to a  
19 Gulf Power owned pole that has -- has a -- a ILEC,  
20 CLEC, regulated or unregulated passenger.

21 BY MR. SEIVER:

22 Q And as far as the poles that were selected

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 that were reviewed, it's true as you say in your  
2 testimony on page 32 that they were never intended to  
3 be a statistical or random sampling of the poles?

4 A Say that one more time, Mr. Seiver?

5 Q Well, will you look -- look at page 32 of  
6 your testimony. You have that? Oh, I'm sorry.

7 JUDGE SIPPEL: Just under the book.

8 THE WITNESS: Thirty-two, line?

9 MR. SEIVER: Thirty-two, lines 17 and 18.

10 THE WITNESS: That's exactly what I said  
11 that -- I -- I just stated the poles actually were  
12 never intended to be statistical or random sampling.

13 BY MR. SEIVER:

14 Q But nonetheless, you would expect the  
15 overall incidents of crowding to be slightly less than  
16 74 percent? What was the basis for that statement?

17 A Well, the Osmose project worked in an area  
18 that was highly dense in joint use poles that I think  
19 would be representative of our system whereas other  
20 areas of the -- they could work in, I would say, would  
21 not be representative.

22 Q So it would only be representative if any



1 -- of other areas of concentrated population as you  
2 say like Panama City or -- or Destin?

3 A Those are parts of our service territory  
4 and those would, if we were allowed to finish, that's  
5 what we would -- those are the areas we would check.

6 Q Why did you say if you were allowed to  
7 finish?

8 A Well, we had significant problems with  
9 weather.

10 Q In May of '05 did you have problems with  
11 weather?

12 A No, sir. That was when we were in the  
13 evaluation stage of the project.

14 Q In June of '05, did you have problems with  
15 weather?

16 A I just -- June is when -- June is when we  
17 had the data that management wanted in order to -- to  
18 examine where we were as far as this audit to go --  
19 going forward.

20 Q And that was on the 10,000 poles of the  
21 150,000 joint use poles?

22 A Yes, sir.